



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,770	06/11/2001	David M. Aronovitz	SUN-P6047-SH	4711
28422	7590	01/13/2005	EXAMINER	
HOYT A. FLEMING III P.O. BOX 140678 BOISE, ID 83714			DESIR, JEAN WICEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/879,770

Applicant(s)

ARONOVITZ, DAVID M.

Examiner

Jean W. Désir

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/15/04, RCE.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 19-47 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakai et al (US 5,973,722).

Claim 1:

Wakai discloses:

“a network adapter”, see Fig. 5 item 526;

“a microprocessor physically and electrically coupled to the network adapter”,
see Fig. 5 item 500;

“a graphics adapter physically and electrically coupled to the microprocessor”,
see Fig. 5 item 530;

“a light valve physically and electrically coupled to the graphics adapter; and a
light source physically coupled to the light valve”, see Fig. 5 items 534, 536;

“wherein the video projector is operable to receive video data in digital form from
the network adapter (526) and wherein the video projector is operable to transfer the
video data to the microprocessor (500), the graphics adapter (530), and the light valve

Art Unit: 2614

(534, 536) in digital form and wherein the video data is output from the graphics adapter (530) in digital form";

the difference between the claimed invention and Wakai's disclosure is that the Wakai's disclosure does not explicitly show a light valve and light source as claimed. However, Wakai's disclosure shows LCD display (items 534, 536 of Fig. 5) that would have rendered the claimed invention obvious to an artisan, because LCD display based on light valve coupled to light source is a very well known device in the art capable of providing high brightness and efficiency without excessive power consumption. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim 2 is met by Fig. 5 item 504 which is a power supply as claimed.

Claims 3, 4 are disclosed, see Fig. 5 item 526, col. 13 line 57.

Claims 8, 9 are obvious to an artisan because of the LCD display (items 534, 536) as explained in the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 2, and the power supply (item 504) is operable to supply power to network adaptor, the microprocessor, the graphics adapter and the light valve as claimed.

Claims 11-13 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2-4.

Claims 17, 18 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 8, 9.

Claim 5:

The claimed limitation "wherein the network adapter is operable to receive and send data packets that are formatted in accordance with the SUN RAY protocol" is not

Art Unit: 2614

explicitly disclosed by Wakai's disclosure, because Wakai does not explicitly teach SUN RAY protocol commands. However, Wakai would have rendered the claimed invention obvious to an artisan, because Wakai suggests that other types of network could alternatively be used for communications (see col. 21 lines 57-58); thus, other types of network that use different protocol commands are at level of one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made.

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 5.

Claim 6:

The claimed limitation "wherein the microprocessor contains circuitry that is operable to receive and process a SET command, a BITMAP command, a FILL command, a COPY command, and a CSCS command from the network adapter" is not explicitly disclosed by Wakai's disclosure, because Wakai does not explicitly teach the commands: SET, BITMAP, FILL, COPY, and CSCS, as claimed. However, microprocessor that is operable to receive and/or process these commands are very well known in the art, or the operation of these commands are at level of an artisan. Therefore, implementation of these commands in Wakai's disclosure would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention was made, because their operation are readily available to the designer.

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 6.

3. Claims 7, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakai et al (US 5,973,722) in view of Wang et al (US 5,928,327).

Claim 7:

The claimed limitation “wherein the video projector also includes an input device and wherein the microprocessor contains circuitry that is operable to receive data from the input device and, based upon the data, send a video modification command to the network adapter” is not explicitly disclosed by Wakai’s disclosure. However, Wang discloses the claimed invention, Wang includes input device that sends VCR-like control commands or video modification commands over a client-server network (see Wang at col. 8 lines 16-32), Wakai in view of Wang would have rendered the claimed invention obvious; an artisan would be motivated to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention, this combination would provide a way to control various aspects of the video image over the network. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not moot in view of the reinterpretation of the reference necessitated by the amendment.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 19-47 are allowed.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2614


6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean W. Désir whose telephone number is (703) 308 9571. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4/9 - First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on (703) 305 4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JWD

Dec. 29, 04


JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600